

On the amelioration of quadratic divergences

R. Delbourgo*

University of Tasmania, GPO Box 252-21, Hobart, Tasmania 7001, Australia

M.D. Scadron**

University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA

(February 1, 2008)

Abstract

Once massless quadratically divergent tadpole diagrams are discarded, because they contain no intrinsic scale, it is possible to convert other divergences into logarithmic form, using partial fraction identities; this includes the case of quadratic divergences, as has been applied to the linear sigma model. However the procedure must be carried out with due care, paying great attention to correct numerator factors.

11.10.Gh, 12.90.+b

In QED one knows that the formally quadratically divergent photon vacuum polarization graph is reduced to a logarithmically divergent singularity by invoking gauge invariance. However, in a linear σ model field theory, involving spinless pion and σ mesons, no principle like gauge invariance can be invoked; yet the quadratic divergence can be tamed and converted into a logarithmic one. This fact was first noted for a quark-level SU(2) model, by using the 2ℓ -dimensional regularization lemma (DRL) [1]:

$$I \equiv \int \bar{d}^4 p \left[\frac{m^2}{(p^2 - m^2)^2} - \frac{1}{p^2 - m^2} \right] = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow 2} \frac{i(m^2)^{\ell-1}}{(4\pi)^\ell} [\Gamma(2 - \ell) + \Gamma(1 - \ell)] = -\frac{im^2}{16\pi^2}, \quad (1)$$

since [2] the combination $\Gamma(2 - \ell) + \Gamma(1 - \ell) = \Gamma(3 - \ell)/(1 - \ell) \rightarrow -1$, as $\ell \rightarrow 2$. In this note we shall show that lemma (1) holds for all regularization schemes which set the massless quadratically divergent tadpole integral $\int d^4 p/p^2$ equal to zero, for the reason that it contains no intrinsic mass scale (dimensional analysis). This therefore includes dimensional regularization [3], analytic and zeta function regularization, Lodder log [4] and Pauli-Villars regularizations [5,6].

To prove the result (1), start with the partial fraction identity

$$\frac{m^2}{(p^2 - m^2)^2} - \frac{1}{p^2 - m^2} = \frac{1}{p^2} \left[\frac{m^4}{(p^2 - m^2)^2} - 1 \right],$$

and integrate the rhs over $\int \bar{d}^4 p$. Making a Wick rotation to $q^2 = -p^2$, $\bar{d}^4 p = i q^2 dq^2 / 16\pi^2$ and dropping the tadpole term, we remain with

$$I = -i \frac{m^4}{16\pi^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{dq^2}{(q^2 + m^2)^2} = -\frac{im^2}{16\pi^2} \quad (2)$$

coinciding with the rhs of (1). An alternative way of reaching this conclusion is to apply the Karlson [7] trick (advocated also by Schwinger):

$$\frac{d}{dm^2} \int \frac{d^4 p}{p^2 - m^2} = \int \frac{d^4 p}{(p^2 - m^2)^2}, \quad (3)$$

since this serves to eliminate a possible quadratic tadpole infinity. Thus one may readily verify, without having to make any statement about quadratic divergences tadpole infinities, that

$$dI/dm^2 = 2m^2 \int \bar{d}^4 p / (p^2 - m^2)^3 = -i/16\pi^2.$$

The only question/problem is what happens when we integrate this up in m^2 . The regularization (1) presumes that no constant Λ^2 intrudes—amounting to setting the tadpole contribution to zero.

At this point we want to inject a note of caution; this concerns numerators of divergent Feynman integrals. Consider the vacuum polarization integral

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi^{\mu\nu}(k) &= ie^2 \text{Tr} \int \frac{[\gamma^\mu((p+k) \cdot \gamma + m) \gamma^\nu(p \cdot \gamma + m)]}{((p+k)^2 - m^2)(p^2 - m^2)} \bar{d}^2\ell p \\ &= c\eta^{\mu\nu} + (k^2 \eta^{\mu\nu} - k^\mu k^\nu) f(k^2). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Gauge invariance requires $c = 0$ (and dimensional regularization will guarantee it). Thus whatever the chosen regularization method, we must insist upon $\Pi^{\mu\nu}(0)$ or $c = 0$. In dimensional regularization one *strictly* finds

$$c_{2\ell} \propto 2^\ell \int \frac{(1/\ell - 1)p^2 + m^2}{(p^2 - m^2)^2} \bar{d}^{2\ell} p \propto 2^\ell [(1/\ell - 1)\Gamma(1 - \ell) - \Gamma(2 - \ell)/\ell] (m^2)^{\ell-1} \equiv 0. \quad (5)$$

The delicate cancellation only works because the correct dimensional factors have been included in the numerator of (4). However if one were blindly to set $\ell = 2$ at the start of eq. (5), one would find

$$c_4 \propto \int \frac{4m^2 - 2p^2}{(p^2 - m^2)^2} \bar{d}^4 p = 2 \int \frac{\bar{d}^4 p}{p^2} \left[-1 + \frac{m^4}{(p^2 - m^2)^2} \right],$$

so dropping the tadpole term directly in 4-D would leave us with a *finite* but *nonzero* contribution $2m^4 \int \bar{d}^4 p / [p^2(p^2 - m^2)^2] \propto m^2$, which is undesirable! It is therefore vitally important to incorporate the correct factors in the numerators of such integrals, before jumping to conclusions. If in any doubt one should apply a regularization scheme which respects the symmetries that one holds dear—such as dimensional regularization.

To conclude, we can with appropriate care interpret the regularized quadratically divergent integral as

$$16i\pi^2 \int \bar{d}^4 p / (p^2 - m^2) = m^2 [\ln(m^2/M^2) + C],$$

where M is some mass scale and C is some indeterminate constant. This form is of course consistent with the once m^2 -differentiated integral:

$$-16i\pi^2 \left(m^2 \frac{d}{dm^2} - 1 \right) \int \frac{\bar{d}^4 p}{p^2 - m^2} = -16i\pi^2 I = -m^2, \quad (6)$$

and it obeys the DRL, eq (1); but the naive ultraviolet cutoff integral $\int \bar{d}^4 p / (p^2 - m^2) = \Lambda^2$ violates all decent regularization schemes discussed above.

The fact that dimensional regularization regards all one-loop divergences as simple poles in ℓ means that, with appropriate care, one should be able to convert them all into ‘logarithmic’ form by suitable discarding all integrals of the type $\int \bar{d}^4 p (p^2)^n$, at least for $n > -2$, because they contain no intrinsic scale. Taming such divergences may have deeper repercussions; in particular, one of the reasons for invoking the elegant idea of supersymmetry is that it provides for a nice cancellation between boson and fermion loop contributions (including the numbers of each), with consequences for fine-tuning. However if these loop contributions are effectively logarithmic, the argument for supersymmetric cancellations is weakened considerably and one requires instead that $\sum_i (-1)^{F_i} g_i^2 m_i^2 [\ln m_i^2 + C]$ be finite, rather than $\sum_i (-1)^{F_i} g_i^2$, with all g_i normally taken to be equal and where the summation is over all spin and charge states.

It should be emphasized that we have not actually eliminated the quadratic divergence, we have simply transmogrified it. [Thus $\lambda\phi^4$ theory still has a dilatation current anomaly, or anomalous dimension for the ϕ -field, which occurs to order λ^2 when ϕ is massless; but a massive ϕ will contribute to the self-mass renormalization to order λ when the tadpole loop *contains a mass*.] Since the above results apply to one-loop diagrams one might well ask if

the tadpole subtraction technique can be extended to higher loops. To show that this can be done, we shall exemplify the process by considering Yukawa theory,

$$\mathcal{L} = Z_\phi[(\partial\phi)^2 - (\mu^2 - \delta\mu^2)\phi^2]/2 + Z_\psi\bar{\psi}[i\gamma\cdot\partial - m + \delta m]\psi + Z_g g\bar{\psi}\gamma_5\psi\phi + Z_\lambda\lambda\phi^4,$$

focusing on the fermion loop contributions up to order g^4 to the meson self-energy, which are the main source of quadratic infinities. (We have taken a pseudoscalar model rather than a scalar model because it renders the calculations more transparent in the soft meson momentum limit). Specifically we shall examine the g^4 overlapping divergence as a good test case of the procedure.

Before doing so, let us take note of a couple of one-loop results as they are needed at the next perturbative order. The meson self-energy to order g^2 is given by

$$\Pi^{(2)}(k) = ig^2 \text{Tr} \int \bar{d}^4p \gamma_5 \frac{1}{\gamma\cdot(p+k) - m} \gamma_5 \frac{1}{\gamma\cdot p - m} = 4ig^2 \int \frac{[p\cdot(p+k) - m^2] \bar{d}^4p}{[(p+k)^2 - m^2][p^2 - m^2]}. \quad (7)$$

For simplicity, renormalise this at $k = 0$, allowing the self-mass counterterm to be massaged from quadratic to logarithmic by tadpole subtraction:

$$\delta\mu^2 = -\Pi^{(2)}(0) = -4ig^2 \int \frac{\bar{d}^4p}{p^2 - m^2} \rightarrow -4ig^2 \int \frac{m^2 \bar{d}^4p}{p^2(p^2 - m^2)}.$$

The wave-function renormalization Z_ϕ , being logarithmic, requires no treatment; nor is it needed for the next part of the argument. The vertex correction is also logarithmic but is required to the next order when considering the overlapping divergent graph, so let us just note that at zero momentum transfer,

$$\Gamma^{(2)}(p) = ig^2 \gamma_5 \int \frac{\bar{d}^4p}{(q-p)^2(q^2 - m^2)}, \quad (8)$$

from which it follows that to order g^2 one can take

$$Z_g = 1 - ig^2 \int \frac{\bar{d}^4q}{q^2(q^2 - m^2)}$$

as the coupling constant counterterm. Observe that we have neglected the mass of the meson, as that has little bearing on the ultraviolet behaviour: the difference $1/(k^2 - \mu^2) - 1/k^2 = \mu^2/k^2(k^2 - \mu^2)$ has improved high-energy convergence; non-vanishing μ just muddies the argument to come.

Now concentrate on the overlapping g^4 order fermion loop contribution to the meson self-energy. *Including the vertex counterterm*, it is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{\text{overlap}}^{(4)}(0) &= -g^4 \text{Tr} \int \bar{d}^4p \left[\gamma_5 \frac{1}{\gamma\cdot p - m} \gamma_5 \frac{1}{\gamma\cdot p - m} \left(\int \frac{\bar{d}^4q}{(q-p)^2} \gamma_5 \frac{1}{\gamma\cdot q - m} \gamma_5 \frac{1}{\gamma\cdot q - m} + i(Z_g - 1) \right) \right] \\ &= 4g^4 \int \frac{\bar{d}^4p}{p^2 - m^2} \int \frac{\bar{d}^4q}{q^2 - m^2} \left(\frac{1}{q^2} - \frac{1}{(q-p)^2} \right) \equiv 4g^4 \int \frac{f(p^2) \bar{d}^4p}{p^2 - m^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The vertex renormalization has guaranteed that the q -integral is finite, but the remaining p -integral is potentially quadratically infinite and it is this part that we wish to convert to

logarithmic by tadpole subtraction. The trick is to notice that $f(p^2)$ can be converted into the dispersive form

$$f(p^2) \propto p^2 \int_{m^2}^{\infty} \frac{ds}{s(s-p^2)} = -\ln(1 - \frac{p^2}{m^2}),$$

whereupon the overlap integral can be re-expressed as

$$\Pi_{\text{overlap}}^{(4)}(0) \propto \int \bar{d}^4 p \int ds \left[\frac{1}{s-m^2} \left(\frac{1}{p^2-m^2} + \frac{1}{s-p^2} \right) - \frac{1}{s(p^2-m^2)} \right].$$

Having manoeuvred the quadratic infinity into suitable form, we can apply the amelioration procedure, $\int \bar{d}^4 p / (p^2 - M^2) \rightarrow \int \bar{d}^4 p M^2 / p^2 (p^2 - M^2)$, and end up with

$$\Pi_{\text{overlap}}^{(4)}(0) \propto \int \frac{\bar{d}^4 p}{p^2} \int \frac{ds}{s-m^2} \left[\frac{m^4}{s(p^2-m^2)} + \frac{s}{s-p^2} \right].$$

Thus we have achieved our goal of conversion of quadratic to logarithmic in *both* of the ‘internal momentum’ integrals. This does not imply that the logarithmic infinities remain at first order like $\log(M^2/m^2)$; indeed we encounter higher powers of logs in the overlapping example above but the important point is that the quadratic infinity has been ameliorated. Of course, this resulting divergence needs as ever to be subtracted by a new fourth order counterterm, but this is just standard renormalization fare and there is no problem with that. For higher loop integrals we are optimistic that the same procedure should work, provided one replaces the logarithmic dispersive integral f by the more general Feynman parametric form (α represents a set of Feynman parameters),

$$f(p^2) \sim p^2 \int d\alpha / [p^2 - M^2(\alpha)],$$

and follows the steps above.

REFERENCES

* EMail: bob.delbourgo@utas.edu.au

** EMail: scadron@physics.arizona.edu

- [1] R. Delbourgo and M.D. Scadron, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A10**, 25 (1995) and hep-ph/9910242.
- [2] We define $\bar{d}p$ as $dp/2\pi$ for each momentum integration.
- [3] G. Leibbrandt, Rev. Mod. Phys. **47**, 849 (1975).
- [4] J.J. Lodder, Physica **A120**, 1 (1983).
- [5] In analytic/zeta regularization, the tadpole integral is to be interpreted as the limit as $\zeta \rightarrow 1, m \rightarrow 0$ of the integral $\int \bar{d}^4p/(p^2 - m^2)^\zeta \propto (m^2)^{2-\zeta}/(\zeta - 1)(\zeta - 2)$, which goes to zero in the *limit order stated*. With Pauli-Villars regularization one simply requires $\sum_i e_i^2 = 1$, summed over ordinary and regulator fields.
- [6] R. Delbourgo, A.A. Rawlinson and M.D. Scadron, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A13**, 1893 (1998) and hep-ph/9807505.
- [7] E. Karlson, Ark. Phys. **7**, 21 (1954).